

Date: Fri, 30 Sep 94 04:30:17 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #470
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 30 Sep 94 Volume 94 : Issue 470

Today's Topics:

 900mhz phone questions.
 Deaf Ham & CW
 Homebrewing and satellites (was Re: Get Over It)
 Rich McAllister, Digital Scourge of the Airwaves

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 28 Sep 94 18:14:14 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!netline-fddi.jpl.nasa.gov!
news.byu.edu!news.mtholyoke.edu!news.umass.edu!news2.near.net!news.delphi.com!
usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 900mhz phone questions.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Rolf Aalto <aalto@u.washington.edu> writes:

>1) Get a phone with higher output. The phone I have is at the FCC Max, but
> could I get a higher output phone from some source I don't know about in
> US or Canada (are the Canadian output limits higher than the US?? BC is
> just up the road from me...)

That'll get you busted by the FCC, even assuming you get the high-output unit
through Customs. (I don't know if the Canadian DOC allows higher-powered
cordless phones than we do, but there are units made in Japan and other
countries for use only in those countries with lax regulation of radio.)

>2) Get a good 900Mhz antenna for the base unit, and perhaps some sort of
> telescoping antenna for the receiver ?? I have not seen any such
> antennas sold. Are they available ??

Better check Part 15 first -- there are strict limits on the types of antennas that can be used, and in the case of cordless phones those antennas must be mounted directly on the transmitter. (Those rooftop verticals that used to be sold for 49 MHz were intended only for the first-generation models that only used VHF for the handset-to-base link; the base transmitted to the handset at around 1650-1700 kHz, so the outdoor antenna was used only for receiving and was quite legal in that application.)

>3) Buy or make a 900Mhz amplifier for the base unit. Are these or the
> plans for them available ??

Maybe, but again the FCC will crucify you for using one.

Date: Wed, 28 Sep 94 17:57:51 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!netline-fddi.jpl.nasa.gov!
news.byu.edu!news.mtholyoke.edu!news.umass.edu!news2.near.net!news.delphi.com!
usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Deaf Ham & CW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Brian Suggs <suggs@tcville.es.hac.com> writes:

>I thought it was because of the ITU treaty, which doesn't have any provisions
>for granting a waiver for disabled persons. The higher speed tests can be
>waived by the FCC since these tests are not required by the treaty.

Exactly -- the FCC has no authority to disregard a treaty, since foreign policy is the responsibility of the President.

Date: 28 Sep 1994 21:01:41 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!
charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!olivea!korie1!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!engnews2.Eng.Sun.COM!
usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Homebrewing and satellites (was Re: Get Over It)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <flaherty.780775034@bora-bora.pa.dec.com> flaherty@pa.dec.com (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>Satellite operation still requires a certain degree of homebrewing, usually

>for dealing with antenna pointing and orbital prediction...

Paul, what do you mean when you say orbital prediction requires a certain degree of homebrewing? Seems to me that I just feed the canned keps off the net into the off-the-shelf software, and there it is. Seems pretty much like appliance operation to me.

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: 28 Sep 1994 21:40:02 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!olivea!korie!male.EBay.Sun.COM!engnews1.Eng.Sun.COM!engnews2.Eng.Sun.COM!usenet@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Rich McAllister, Digital Scourge of the Airwaves

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <wyn.200.2E89B96D@ornl.gov> wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX) writes:

>Second, he should have asked QRL (is the frequency busy?). Then C.W. in
>Chicago would have been alerted that his QSO was about to be clobbered, and
>replied R, R(roger). Pete could hear Chicago because he was closer and
>might choose to QSY realizing he was on top of C.W. who was listening to
>Wally. This is common practice on both HF phone and CW before sending CQ
>and prevents tons of QRM.

>

>Why can't the digital folks do this? Can they not send the code? (QRL) Can
>they not receive the code?(R R) Did they not learn the code? How did they
>get HF access? Even RTTY and SSTV ops used to do this. What happened
>to change this practice?

Well, dunno. Even if they couldn't send four characters of code by hand, it's possible to get most multimode TNC's to send it. Even if they couldn't decode the response, how hard would it be to figure out that there's somebody there sending something? (Who's going to send back "NO" to a QRL?) There is a trickiness factor here, in that many people are running AFSK, and would have to tune down by the average of the mark and space frequencies (usually about 2 KHz) so that the CW signal would occupy the same spot as the digital signals. But that has nothing to do with knowing or not knowing code...

I admit that when sending a digital CQ I personally haven't been sending QRL in CW after listening and before transmitting, but then I only operate digital well within the usual RTTY/digital sub-bands, and I always sort of

figured that nobody was listening for CW signals there anyway. But I think I'll start. I'm still not going to listen to the noise and modem tones, though.

[BTW, I don't know where you and Jeff got this idea that digital ops all run QRO. I don't even have an amplifier, and nobody I've ever worked on PacTOR has ever been running more than 170 watts.]

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: 28 Sep 1994 20:42:11 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!netline-fddi.jpl.nasa.gov!
news.byu.edu!news.mtholyoke.edu!news.umass.edu!news2.near.net!cat.cis.Brown.EDU!
pstc3!md@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <092794091807Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <CwtJ26.DGI@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<092894124554Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Subject : Re: Interesting data

In article <092894124554Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

|> >>Jeff, when does $1 + 1 = 10$?
|> >
|> >That's easy: In the base two numerical system!
|>
|> You're catchin' on Jeff..... ;-)

Only when you have a two-bit accumulator. Otherwise, its 0 with the carry flag set on.

MD

Date: 28 Sep 1994 20:40:17 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!netline-fddi.jpl.nasa.gov!
news.byu.edu!news.mtholyoke.edu!news.umass.edu!news2.near.net!cat.cis.Brown.EDU!
pstc3!md@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <3697qu\$1q1@news.iastate.edu>, <CwszG9.80E@news.Hawaii.Edu>,

<092894121443Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>is.Bro
Subject : Re: Even more interesting (was Re: Interesting data)

In article <092894121443Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

|> In part a trained pool of operators. And
|> I reject the suggestion that "anyone" can just pick up a radio and
|> EFFECTIVELY communicate.

So your definition of a trained pool of operators is "someone who knows
how to talk on the radio".

10-4.

MD

Date: Wed, 28 Sep 1994 18:43:57 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!usc!
howland.reston.ans.net!swrinde!emory!cs.utk.edu!stc06.CTD.ORN.L.GOV!
xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!wyn@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Sep24.155014.6458@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <Cwnqx5.KC@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<RFM.94Sep28095811@urth.eng.sun.com>inde
Subject : Re: Rich McAllister, Digital Scourge of the Airwaves

In article <RFM.94Sep28095811@urth.eng.sun.com> rfm@urth.eng.sun.com
(Richard McAllister) writes:

[a bunch of insightful stuff on his digital operating practices]

>Rich, K06CL

OK, first I do not now own or operate nor have I ever owned or operated a
digital mode RF system. And the way things are going I may never. Who would
want to get their reputation tarred such by examples we hear daily of rude HF
packetees. Anyway, if I want to go digital, I will rent a SLIP connection
to an internet provider and hitch hike QRM free on one lane of the information
highway. Nonetheless, your response is interesting. Lets take a hypothetical
situation (names changed to protect the innocent) and see if I understand all
of the mechanics correctly.

I am in Chicago having a CW QSO on 7.040 MHz with Wally in Walawala.
Packeteer Pete in Pittsburg has just invested heavily in his Krazy Kam 2000
TNC and FTSI1000 HF transceiver and his 486 Pentium Godzilla monitor.

He is eager to get some digital QSO's under his belt. So he tunes to 7.040 MHz and, based on lessons from R.M.'s book of HF digital etiquette, he listens. He does not hear Wally in Walawala sending to C.W. in Chicago. So he turns down the volume, shifts into the "This is Packeteer Pete, is anybody there? {listen}, {time-out}, {try again} mode, and lets 'er rip. He backs down the power in his Henry 10K until the plates change color from white hot to just red hot (heavy duty cycle there).

What is wrong with this picture? Well first perhaps Pete should have realized that he was in a portion of the 40 M band heavily used by QRP CW ops. Second, he should have asked QRL (is the frequency busy?). Then C.W. in Chicago would have been alerted that his QSO was about to be clobbered, and replied R, R(roger). Pete could hear Chicago because he was closer and might choose to QSY realizing he was on top of C.W. who was listening to Wally. This is common practice on both HF phone and CW before sending CQ and prevents tons of QRM.

Why can't the digital folks do this? Can they not send the code? (QRL) Can they not receive the code?(R R) Did they not learn the code? How did they get HF access? Even RTTY and SSTV ops used to do this. What happened to change this practice?

73,
C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX
wyn@ornl.gov

=====
= Cooperation requires participation. Competition teaches cooperation. =
=====

Date: 28 Sep 94 17:57:14 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!bora-bora.pa.dec.com!flaherty@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <369t6q\$5rb@nntpd.lkg.dec.com>, <flaherty.780702591@bora-bora.pa.dec.com>, <36aja1\$pav@nntpd.lkg.dec.com>
Subject : Re: Get Over It

little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little) writes:

>Let me see if I can paraphrase the posts:

>4) I pointed out that those modes were not in widespread usage
>among the world wide amateur population, that they in general required
>more expensive equipment, larger more visible antennas, and much higher
>ERPs resulting in potentially more RFI.

>5) You counter that it is *possible* to build an inexpensive satellite
>station.

No, I also countered your points on equipment, antennas, and RFI.

>Also I keep hearing a tone in this argument and others that some here seem
>to feel it is their duty to be protectors of the bandwidth. The underlying
>motivation seems to be keep others off their turf. The pro-code testing
>crowd don't want the unwashed masses infringing upon their sacred ground.

Now, I *could* counter that I keep hearing a whining tone in this argument
and others amongst the anti-code testing crowd. But that would be insulting,
pointless, and counterproductive, not to mention an unprovable assertion.
But I try real hard not to be insulting, pointless, and counterproductive,
and not to assert things unprovable.

>PS I still want to know why long distance communications on the VHF+ bands
> isn't available to appliance operators, to wit "The point is that long
> distance communications is available on the VHF+ bands, but not to
> appliance operators."

Satellite operation still requires a certain degree of homebrewing, usually
for dealing with antenna pointing and orbital prediction; similar caveats
apply to moonbounce. As far as I'm aware, no off-the-shelf meteor burst
system exists.

--

- =Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@pa.dec.com | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #470
